SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON PROSECUTION COORDINATION COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

STATE AUDITOR'S REPORT
JUNE 30, 2000

State of South Carolina



Office of the State Auditor

1401 MAIN STREET, SUITE 1200 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

THOMAS I WAGNER, JR., CPA

(803) 253-4160 INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES 0723

June 20, 2001

The Honorable Jim Hodges, Governor and Members of the Commission South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination Columbia, South Carolina

We have performed the procedures described below, which were agreed to by the Commission and management of the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination (the Commission), solely to assist you in evaluating the performance of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000, in the areas addressed. This engagement to apply agreed-upon procedures was performed in accordance with standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the specified users of the report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose. The procedures and the associated findings are as follows:

1. We tested all recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were properly described and classified in the accounting records and internal controls over the tested receipt transactions were adequate. We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in the State's accounting system (STARS) as reflected on the Comptroller General's reports to determine if recorded revenues were in agreement. We made inquiries and performed substantive procedures to determine if revenue collection and retention or remittance were supported by law. We compared current year recorded revenues from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year to determine the reasonableness of collected and recorded amounts by revenue account. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

The Honorable Jim Hodges, Governor and Members of the Commission South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination June 20, 2001

- We tested selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were properly described and classified in the accounting records, were bona fide disbursements of the Commission and were paid in conformity with State laws and regulations and if internal controls over the tested disbursement transactions were adequate. We also tested selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were recorded in the proper fiscal year. We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in various STARS reports to determine if recorded expenditures were in agreement. We compared current year expenditures to those of the prior year to determine the reasonableness of amounts paid and recorded by expenditure account. The individual transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
- 3. We tested selected recorded payroll disbursements to determine if the tested payroll transactions were properly described, classified, and distributed in the accounting records; persons on the payroll were bona fide employees; payroll transactions, including employee payroll deductions, were properly authorized and were in accordance with existing legal requirements; and internal controls over the tested payroll transactions were adequate. We tested selected payroll vouchers to determine if the vouchers were properly approved and if the gross payroll agreed to amounts recorded in the general ledger and in STARS. We also tested payroll transactions for new employees and those who terminated employment to determine if internal controls over these transactions were adequate. We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in various STARS reports to determine if recorded payroll and fringe benefit expenditures were in agreement. We performed other procedures such as comparing current year payroll expenditures to those of the prior year; comparing the percentage change in personal service expenditures to the percentage change in employer contributions; and computing the percentage distribution of fringe benefit expenditures by fund source and comparing the computed distribution to the actual distribution of recorded payroll expenditures by fund source to determine if recorded payroll and fringe benefit expenditures were reasonable by expenditure account. The individual transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
- 4. We tested selected recorded journal entries and all appropriation transfers to determine if these transactions were properly described and classified in the accounting records; they agreed with the supporting documentation, were adequately documented and explained, were properly approved, and were mathematically correct; and the internal controls over these transactions were adequate. The journal entries selected for testing were chosen judgmentally. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
- We tested selected entries and monthly totals in the subsidiary records of the Commission to determine if the amounts were mathematically accurate; the numerical sequences of selected document series were complete; the selected monthly totals were accurately posted to the general ledger; and the internal controls over the tested transactions were adequate. The transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

The Honorable Jim Hodges, Governor and Members of the Commission South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination June 20, 2001

- 6. We obtained all monthly reconciliations prepared by the Commission for the year ended June 30, 2000, and tested selected reconciliations of balances in the Commission's accounting records to those in STARS as reflected on the Comptroller General's reports to determine if they were accurate and complete. For the selected reconciliations, we recalculated the amounts, agreed the applicable amounts to the Commission's general ledger, agreed the applicable amounts to the STARS reports, determined if reconciling differences were adequately explained and properly resolved, and determined if necessary adjusting entries were made in the Commission's accounting records and/or in STARS. The reconciliations selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
- 7. We tested the Commission's compliance with all applicable financial provisions of the South Carolina Code of Laws, Appropriation Act, and other laws, rules, and regulations for fiscal year 2000. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
- 8. We obtained copies of all closing packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2000, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Comptroller General. We reviewed them to determine if they were prepared in accordance with the Comptroller General's GAAP Closing Procedures Manual requirements; if the amounts were reasonable; and if they agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
- 9. We obtained a copy of the schedule of federal financial assistance for the year ended June 30, 2000, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Auditor. We reviewed it to determine if it was prepared in accordance with the State Auditor's letter of instructions; if the amounts were reasonable; and if they agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

We were not engaged to, and did not, perform an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the specified areas, accounts, or items. Further, we were not engaged to express an opinion on the effectiveness of the internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express such opinions. Had we performed additional procedures or had we conducted an audit or review of the Commission's financial statements or any part thereof, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Governor and of the governing body and management of the Commission and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

State Auditor

OF copies	of this dos	numont wo	ro publiche	ad at an oct	imated prin	ting cost of	\$1.17 oach	and a
total printil on printing	ng cost of a costs be a	\$29.25. Tadded to the	he FY 200 ne docume	00-01 Appront.	priation Ac	t requires th	at this inforn	nation
total printing	ng cost of g costs be a	\$29.25. Tadded to the	The FY 200 The docume	00-01 Appront.	opriation Ac	t requires th	\$1.17 each, at this inforn	nation
total printing	ng cost of g costs be	\$29.25. Tadded to the	The FY 200	ou at all est 00-01 Appro nt.	opriation Ac	t requires th	at this inforn	nation
total printing	ng cost of g costs be	\$29.25. Tadded to the	The FY 200	ou at all est 00-01 Appro nt.	opriation Ac	t requires th	at this inforn	nation
total printing	ng cost of g costs be	\$29.25. Tadded to the	The FY 200	ou at all est 00-01 Appro nt.	ppriation Ac	t requires th	at this inforn	nation
total printing	ng cost of g costs be	\$29.25. Tadded to the	The FY 200	ou at all est 00-01 Appro nt.	ppriation Ac	t requires th	at this inforn	nation
total printing	ng cost of g costs be	\$29.25. Tadded to the	The FY 200	ou at all est 00-01 Appro nt.	ppriation Ac	t requires th	at this inform	nation